



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the scope of Article I, it shall be referred to arbitration."

But now, if you will look at the provision, you will find that this is a distinct paragraph and not a part of and not intended to modify the preceding paragraph as to the non-conclusiveness of all of the decisions of the commission. It is rather, Mr. President, a modification of the first article.

Now, let us look into that a little. Under Article I, the President could not submit a case to arbitration—that is, he could not formulate an agreement, and that is what "submit to arbitration" means, so far as he is concerned—and submit it to the Senate for its advice and consent, when he considered that such an agreement would not be within the scope of Article I, even though the whole world might believe otherwise, and though every Member of the Senate might believe otherwise. So this second article is inserted providing for a commission to investigate, and it is intended by this provision, which the majority report seeks to strike out, to insure the proper preliminary steps being taken when the question is so clearly within the scope of Article I as to receive the unanimous, or lacking but one of the unanimous, report of the commission. When the case is so clearly within the scope of Article I as to secure such a finding, then the preliminary steps shall be taken to bring the matter before the Senate for its advice, even though the President might not be satisfied that the case was clearly within the scope of Article I. In such case it is made his duty to take the initiatory steps to bring the matter before the Senate for its advice, and without that there is no duty imposed upon him to bring it before the Senate for its advice. Suppose, in the matter of the Venezuelan trouble, to which I have referred, the President of the United States, for political or other reasons, or because he wanted to have his own way, had answered the final note that came from Great Britain, in which that country disclaimed any intention to take territory other than that which it had claimed, prior to the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, by denying the right of arbitration upon the ground that the Monroe Doctrine is not an arbitrable question, and therefore the subsidiary question as to whether Great Britain was seeking territory outside of what she held prior to the Monroe Doctrine was not an arbitrable question. In such case the matter could never have gotten before the Senate for its consent and advice.

This is the view taken by the negotiators of these instruments, the President and the Secretary of State. And this is the only view that will harmonize all of its provisions. And between a construction which will give harmony and effect to every provision of an instrument and a construction that will leave them in conflict, or that will compel us to eliminate—as I will soon show we must eliminate—some word or words as having no purpose, the former must be adopted.

Mr. BACON: Mr. President, may I be permitted by the Senator to ask him a question at that point?

Mr. McCUMBER: Certainly.

Mr. BACON: I understand the proposition, which the Senator is arguing with great earnestness and force, to be that if the Senate, after the joint high commission has adjudged a certain question to be justiciable, should disagree with that commission, the Senate would be authorized under the terms of this treaty to refuse to submit it to arbitration?

Mr. McCUMBER: In exactly the same way as it would if it had come directly from the President in the first instance without being passed upon by the commission.

(Much of the running debate which followed is omitted, as it did not throw any essential light on Senator McCumber's position.)

(Concluded next month.)

Can War Be Abolished?

By Ralph Blumberg.

The twentieth century has brought forth inventions and improvements which far surpass anything in former years, and it seems we are rapidly approaching an era of perfection, not alone in the industrial sphere, but also as regards civilization, elevation of morals, and social advancement. However, the most important progress remains to be accomplished. Looking at it from a humanitarian point of view, it has to be made in a different field altogether, and has for its object nothing less than the realization of the establishment of permanent peace among all the nations of the globe.

In connection with the establishment of the International Peace Tribunal at The Hague, two international conferences have been held for the purpose of considering measures to assure permanent peace, and another will be held at The Hague in 1915. All this indicates an ardent desire to remove all causes that possibly could lead to hostilities between nations and the prevention of the fearful horrors of war, the misery and blight that follow in its wake.

"Thou shalt not kill" is one of the commandments brought down by Moses from Mt. Sinai, forty-two hundred years ago. About sixteen hundred years later came the prophecy of Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." The commandment of God has been totally ignored by the killing of people in continuous wars, with the consequence that every one of the ten commandments has been broken. The prophecy of the immortal seer has been disregarded. The nations are continually increasing their armaments, and the cruel art of war is practiced on a more extensive scale than in the days of idol worship, darkness, and barbarism. With the progress of civilization the horrors of bloodshed have not diminished; on the contrary, war has been made an art, the study of which many great men have made their object in life, and through which they have become famous in history. Such men were the conqueror Cyrus, who, not content with ruling Persia, attempted the conquest of all Asia; Alexander the Great, who cried for more worlds to conquer; Julius Cæsar, who carried war into every country of Europe and Africa.

The last century witnessed the rise and fall of the Emperor Napoleon, whose ambition was to master the whole of Europe, which he had almost accomplished when fate turned against him and commanded a halt to the pillage and murder.

It is those men that were the idols of their respective nations, and all the countries that were penetrated had either to submit to them or lay their country open to the curse of war.

Conditions are not much improved in the present century. On the contrary, war has been developed from an art to a science, and millions of people are employed in

its furtherance. The instruments of war have become even more terrible in their execution; demoniac destructives have been invented, such as gunnery, torpedoes, and other murderous explosives, by which means as many human lives can be destroyed by a few discharges as were sacrificed in an entire battle in the middle ages. (In the late Russo-Japanese war, Admiral Makaroff's flagship, "The Petropavlosk," with about seven hundred men, was destroyed by a single torpedo discharge.)

When a war is raging, the belligerent nations assemble each in their houses of worship and pray to God for the victory of their arms on the battlefield—that is, that the Lord may lend His aid to exterminate the enemy. In every case the prayer of each nation is, in part at least, answered, for thousands upon thousands of human beings are slaughtered by both armies.

It would be impossible, it seems, to abolish war within this present generation, as the continuous wars which have been raging for thousands of years have handed down the horrible practice until it has assumed the form of an instinct in the minds of the people. There can be only one way to obtain this object, and that is to root out the instinct of destructiveness by teaching the rising generation in the public schools to consider every act of violence and wanton aggressiveness as a crime where means are employed that become hazardous to human life. They should be impressed to harbor kindly feelings toward all mankind and to follow the command as expressed in the Bible:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

A child's mind is easily formed by the impressions it receives. The early inceptions and acquirements of childhood will build up gradually its character. The faculty of imitation, being the first organ that is developed in the brain, becomes naturally a means of absorbing further intelligence. For this reason, children should be given good moral teachings, and it is imperative for their parents to set a good example that would encourage the children to follow them.

Constant education, in the sense heretofore mentioned, will by degrees bring about the extinction of the destructive instincts of the human mind. Crime and moral depravity will diminish and fraternal sentiments toward everybody will be engendered, regardless of creed or race.

BALTIMORE, MD.

New Impetus for World Peace.

By Joseph H. Hannen, Secretary of the Persian-American Educational Society.

[The publication of this instructive article must not be interpreted as in any way committing the ADVOCATE OF PEACE to Bahaism as a whole. The peace features of Bahaism must interest all pacifists.—Ed.]

In these days of peace conferences and warlike preparations, of arbitration treaties and armed trespass, the Orient has sounded a fresh and dominant note which bids fair to be the clarion call for the realization of the parliament of nations. Particular interest attaches to the visit of Abbas Effendi, known as "Abdul Baha" (the servant of God), to the United States this spring, because of the effective measures for world peace undertaken by the Bahais, of which he is the central figure

today. His father, Baha'o'llah, is considered as a universal advocate of peace by the followers of this movement. Eminent orientalists and world-travelers credit the movement with several millions of followers, of every nation and religious system, and the cause is claiming thousands of converts in Europe and America. Briefly, its chief tenet is religious unity and solidarity and interdependence amongst the nations; the movement recognizes all of the great world religions as being inspired, and their truths are linked and apparent differences reconciled in a manner which establishes the history of religion and universalizes great principles. The most remarkable fact is that the teaching which shows such breadth was given to the world, more than forty years ago, from the heart of Persia. Its founders were persecuted by the Moslem world and spent a lifetime in imprisonment, exile, and banishment. Now the recent reforms in the Orient are traced directly to these teachings, and the prophecies of Baha'o'llah are being rapidly fulfilled. Abdul Baha, who does not call himself a prophet, but the servant of God, gives this interesting bit of history in regard to the movement of peace, in a letter sent by him to the secretary of the Mohonk Lake Conference on International Arbitration:

"About fifty years ago, in the Book of Akdas, Baha'o'llah commanded the people to establish the universal peace, and summoned all the nations to the Divine Banquet of International Arbitration, so that the questions of boundaries, of national honor and property, and of vital interests between nations might be decided by an arbitral court of justice, and that no nation would dare to refuse to abide by the decisions. If any quarrel arise between two nations, it must be adjudicated by this international court and be arbitrated by and decided upon like the judgment rendered by the judge between individuals. If at any time any nation dares to break such a treaty, all the other nations must arise to put down this rebellion."

It is recognized by students of world affairs that the greatest obstacle to world-peace is religious and racial differences. In trade conferences between nations of the Occident and the Orient, the delegates from eastern countries have withdrawn or refused to participate in banquets because their religious belief forbade eating with a Christian, or a Moslem with a Jew, a high-caste Buddhist with a Parsee, etc. Furthermore, there is always the menace of the "holy war," so-called, which the high pontiffs of the Moslem world may call at any time. This, in turn, is a survival of the Mosaic dispensation, so graphically described in our Old Testament. As long as the monarchs of Christian nations term themselves "the defenders of faith" (as though true religion needed any armed defense!), so long will the world be separated by great differences which engender warfare. The far-reaching effect of the Bahai teachings is herein seen, because through its precepts all religious, caste, and race prejudices are removed and war is forbidden. Bahais are forbidden to carry arms or to engage in warfare. Abdul Baha, in Paris, recently stated the position of the Bahais in this wise: "You are a people banded together to increase friendship among nations and races, and brotherhood among men. So now, while these men (referring to the armies of Italy and Turkey) are creating death, you think life; while they are guilty of cruelty, you think tenderness; while